

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 059

CS 505 460

AUTHOR Marston, Peter J.; And Others
TITLE What Is This Thing Called Love? The Subjective Experience and Communication of Romantic Love.
INSTITUTION Arizona State Univ., Tempe. Communication Research Center.
PUB DATE Feb 86
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Tucson, AZ, February 15-19, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affection; Affective Behavior; *Attachment Behavior; *Communication Research; Cooperation; *Emotional Experience; Emotional Response; Eye Contact; *Interpersonal Communication; *Interpersonal Relationship; Security (Psychology); *Self Expression; Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS Commitment; *Love

ABSTRACT

A study examined the subjective experience of love (the feelings associated with love and the meanings attributed to these feelings) and the manners in which love is communicated. Face-to-face interviews were conducted with 76 respondents (ages ranged from 21 to 54, with 52% over 30 years old). In the first part of the interview, respondents were asked four questions: (1) What is the feeling of love? (2) What physiological factors or changes are associated with love? (3) If this love has/had a color, what would it be? and (4) If you could say a rhythm expresses/expressed this love, what would it be? In the second section of the interview, respondents were asked to describe how they communicated love to their partner, and how their partner communicated love to them. Cluster analysis revealed six types of romantic love experiences: collaborative love, active love, secure love, intuitive love, committed love, and traditional romantic love. The results support two general conclusions. First, love may be experienced in a variety of different manners: in terms of relational constructs, physiological responses, intuitive perceptions, and/or behavioral actions. Second, there is a strong coherence between lovers' perceptions of love and their reports of how love is communicated. (Author/SRT)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED278059

COMMUNICATION RESEARCH CENTER

WHAT IS THIS THING CALLED LOVE?:

THE SUBJECTIVE EXPERIENCE AND COMMUNICATION OF ROMANTIC LOVE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

☐ Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

Peter J. Marston
Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Michael L. Hecht
Department of Communication
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287

Tia Robers
I.B.M.
Westlake Village, CA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Peter J. Marston

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper Presented to the
Interpersonal Communication Division
of the
Western Speech Communication Association
Tucson, AZ

February, 1986

Department of Communication
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS 505460

What is This Thing Called Love?:

The Subjective Experience and Communication of Romantic Love

Abstract

Whereas previous research into romantic love has focused upon the traits of love objects, beliefs about love, and/or types of loving relationships, this study examines the subjective experience of love (the feelings associated with love and the meanings attributed to these feelings) and the manners in which love is communicated. 76 respondents participated in face-to-face interviews. Responses were content and cluster analyzed. Cluster analysis revealed six types of romantic love experiences: collaborative love, active love, secure love, intuitive love, committed love, and traditional romantic love. The results support two general conclusions. First, love may be experienced in a variety of different manners: in terms of relational constructs, physiological responses, intuitive perceptions, and/or behavioral actions. Second, there is a strong coherence between lovers' perceptions of love and their reports of how love is communicated. Further research is warranted, focusing upon the interaction of love experiences in dyadic loveships.

What is This Thing Called Love?:

The Subjective Experience and Communication of Romantic Love

Of all human emotions, romantic love is perhaps the most mysterious. "Falling in love" is often described as an irrational experience--but one with an almost magical emancipatory capacity to transcend the very limitations of human existence (Alberoni, 1983). The transcendent nature of romantic love seems to defy verbal expression, let alone rational explanation. And while there are those who will say that romantic love is necessarily naive and idealistic, there are also those, confident for the moment, who will say that for one who has loved, no explanation is necessary, and that for one who has never loved, no explanation is possible. However, if the nature and functions of romantic love are to be understood by psychologists and communicologists alike, then some explanation must be attempted.

The importance of love, romantic and otherwise, has been articulated by scholars from a variety of fields. Magda Arnold (1960) classifies love as a primary emotion--one which is inherent to human experience. In Joseph De Rivera's structural theory of emotion (1977), love is one of four basic "movements" in human relationships, and as such is a central component of the human system of emotions. An even higher status is accorded love in Ashley Montagu's description of human development (1970). Montagu maintains that the need for love is the most important of all human needs, and that love is the directional force in human development. Similarly, psychologist Nathaniel Branden (1980), writing to a popular audience, declares love to be the paramount human expression--the highest appraisal of self-benefit and self-fulfillment.

Although romantic love has been a prominent, even ubiquitous theme in literature and the popular arts, until recently there has been very little empirical or theoretical work on the subject. Previously,

when love was given a "serious" or academic treatment, it was usually at the hands of philosophers and theoretical psychologists. Writers from Plato (1969) to Erich Fromm (1956) have tackled the issues of romantic love from a metaphysical/normative perspective, speculating on the nature of a "real" or "true" love. The works of such writers, though insightful, are not empirically grounded and therefore, may not reflect accurately the nature and functions of romantic love as it exists in our society. Indeed, both Plato and Fromm would consider many contemporary romantic relationships as exaggerated infatuation or desire, and therefore, as somehow "unreal."

Recently, however, romantic love has become a reputable area for social scientific inquiry (Hendrick, Hendrick, Foote, & Slapion-Foote, 1984). To date, social scientific research concerning romantic love has employed analyses which are typically either formal, correlational, or dimensional.

Many scholars, operating almost exclusively from cognitive (e.g., Averill, 1980; Seligman, Fazio, & Zanna, 1980) or physiological (e.g., Clynes, 1978; Pribram, 1980) orientations, offer definitions and explanations of love which are essentially formal. Although the findings of this research are clearly important and useful, such explanations do not reveal the content or meaning of love in a substantive sense, but rather the form love takes within the particular paradigm of human nature (e.g., cognitivism or behaviorism). Such formal analyses tend to ignore the complex character of romantic love. As Joseph DeVito comments, love is "an activity of the whole person, in which body and mind and emotions are all actively involved" (1980, p.498). Any analysis which attempts to locate and define love within a single realm of experience is likely to give us a vision of romantic love which is, at best, incomplete. Indeed, the very fact that researchers find empirical evidence for both cognitive and physiological bases of love belies the ambitions of any unilateral formal analysis.

Romantic love has also been examined through correlational analysis. In this type of study, romantic love is used as an independent variable, measured against other variables such as sex (Hendrick et al.,

1984), shyness (Moroiodo, 1982), hypnotic susceptibility (Mathes, 1982), self-preoccupation (Johnston & Jeremko, 1979), and cognitive orientation (Seligman et al., 1980). While such studies are valuable in developing relationships between love and other constructs, the validity of this research remains contingent upon the validity of the love measures employed--measures which are generally derived from previous dimensional analyses.

The most notable dimensional analyses of romantic love are those of Zick Rubin (1970, 1973) and John Alan Lee (1973). Practically all the existent correlational research on love is based upon the work of either Rubin or Lee.

Both Rubin and Lee attempt to describe romantic love in a qualitative sense by establishing dimensions of love and then validating these dimensions empirically. Rubin begins deductively, hypothesizing three interpersonal attitudes associated with love objects: affiliative and dependent need, predisposition to help, and exclusiveness and absorption (1970). He later designates these as : attachment, caring and intimacy (1973). Using these attitudes as dimensional components of loving, Rubin develops a measure of romantic which he validates against couples' perceptions of their relationship and their likelihood of marriage (1970).

Although Rubin finds significant correlations between his measure and the perceptions of the couples tested, there are certain limitations to his analysis. First, as a deductively derived system, Rubin's dimensions may not be exhaustive (Wiseman & Schenck-Hamlin, 1981). There is simply no way of knowing whether or not components of love have been overlooked, even after validating all or part of Rubin's measure. Second, Rubin restricts his analysis to attitudes toward love objects. As noted above, love is a complex emotional experience, involving not only attitudes, but also physiological and intuitive responses as well. Third, Rubin defines romantic love as "love between unmarried opposite-sex peers, of the sort which could possibly lead to marriage" (1970, 266), and accordingly, validates his measure with

a sample of dating (unmarried, non-engaged) couples. The bifurcation of romantic love and marriage is problematic, especially given our socio-cultural identification of these two experiences.

Whereas Rubin examines attitudes toward love objects, Lee focuses his analysis on the behavioral referents associated with love. He begins inductively, categorizing over 4,000 literary and philosophical statements concerning love. Lee (1973) arrives at three behavioral dimensions: eros (eroticism), ludus (playfulness), and storge (friendship). These dimensions exist separately or in combination, resulting in a typology of nine styles or "colors" of romantic love. Through interviews with 112 men and women, Lee empirically confirms eight of the nine styles. It is important to note that the sample from which Lee induces his dimensions and the sample he employs for validation may not be commensurable. Indeed, the philosophers, poets, and dramatists Lee employs to develop his dimensions of love and his typology of styles are likely to have conceptions of love and loving which are divergent from the general public. As we noted above, if one is interested in understanding love as it exists, then one should begin not with speculation or literature, but rather with lovers.

The contributions of Rubin and Lee provide a useful starting point for the empirical study of love. However, these researchers have largely ignored the subjective experience of love, focusing instead upon the attitudinal components of love and behavioral styles of loving. Other more recent studies have sought to examine love through a consideration of lovers' perceptions of loveships.

Daniel Prentice, Nancy Briggs, and David Bradley (1983) analyze the attitudes of American university students toward behaviors which the students themselves associate with romantic relationships. Three categories of behaviors were significantly correlated with romantic love: traditional romance (e.g., saying "I love you"), sexual behavior, and routine activities (e.g., jogging together). Although this study clearly has important implications for the communication scholar interested in examining loving relationships (presumably, behaviors associated with love are likely to be employed to

communicate love), such issues are not addressed specifically.

In his study of interpretive themes in relational communication, William Owen (1984) considers a variety of relationships: married couples, romantic dating couples, relatives, live-in friends, and other friends. Although the nature of romantic love is not examined as an independent construct and neither is the communication of romantic love, this study does reveal the interpretive themes employed by married and dating couples to make sense of their relational episodes. Married couples are likely to see their relationships as unique, fragile, and based upon mutual consideration. Although dating couples also employ a theme of fragility, they are more likely to see their relationships as based upon commitment.

The present study seeks to build upon this research by examining both the experience of romantic love and the relationship between lovers' perceptions of love and the manner in which love is communicated. Whereas previous research into romantic love has focused upon the traits of love objects, beliefs about love, and/or types of loving relationships, the subjective experience of love (the feelings associated with love and the meanings attributed to these feelings) remains to be examined in a systematic manner (Katz, 1976). Further, previous studies concerning love have largely ignored the role of communication and its impact on loving relationships. However, the importance of communication in determining and altering relationships is paramount, as Mark Knapp suggests: "Communication may be affected by the existing relationship, but it will also structure the nature of any future relationship" (1978, p. 8). We approach this analysis inductively, seeking our primary data from lovers themselves, in hopes of developing a more complete understanding of love as it exists and as it is communicated.

METHODS

The data for this study were obtained through face-to-face interviews with 76 respondents selected by the interviewers. Respondents were chosen by two criteria: that the interviewer and respondent had an interpersonal relationship, and that the interviewer considered the respondent to be perceptive about

emotions and interpersonal relationships. It was hoped that respondents selected in this manner would provide more detailed and intimate responses than would respondents selected in a more random fashion.

Respondents:

The sample was evenly distributed in terms of sex. Ages ranged from 21 to 54, with 52% of the sample over 30 years old. Respondents were single, married or cohabitating. The sample included both partners of 19 love dyads (50% of the total sample). Respondents' incomes ranged from \$10,000 to \$110,000 per year. Educational background varied considerably with 60% of the sample having college degrees.

Procedures:

Interviewers were trained to follow an interview schedule and use follow-up questions to obtain full and complete responses. Because of variance in the interview conditions, interviewers recorded the responses as close to verbatim as the situation permitted. This minimized the effects of interviewer interpretation regarding the data.

Interviews were typically held in the respondent's residence and lasted between 20 and 30 minutes. Each respondent was given a brief oral description of the study's intent. They were informed that they were participating in a study of human emotions and the communication of these emotions. When both partners of a love dyad were present, the respondents were separated and interviewed separately so they could not discuss the questions until the interviews had been completed.

The interview schedule consisted of two sections. The first section included four questions designed to elicit the respondent's own experiential definition of love. Respondents were asked to focus their attention upon an actual love relationship--a heterosexual, romantic, reciprocated love--either in the present or the recent past. They were then asked four questions: (1) What is the feeling of love? (2) What physiological factors or changes are associated with love? (3) If this love has/had a "color," what would it

be? (4) If you could say a rhythm expresses/expressed this love, what would it be? Questions were asked in sequence, with responses following each separate question. In this manner, respondents were unlikely to anticipate subsequent questions. Question #1 was the central question in this section, with the other questions designed to prompt a more complete consideration of the respondent's love experience (including both physiological and intuitive aspects). Respondents were not required to answer all questions, and indeed, most respondents reported that they could not answer one or more of the latter questions or that it was unnecessary to do so.

The second section of the interview schedule concerned the communication of love. Respondents were asked to describe how they communicated love to their partner (sending love), and how their partner communicated love to them (receiving love).

RESULTS

Responses from the interviews were analyzed in three stages. First, categories were constructed from content analysis. Second, the categories were used to code the interviews. Third, the category frequencies were cluster analyzed.

In the content analysis of interview responses, separate analyses were conducted for each of the six questions included in the interview schedule. The answers to each question were copied onto index cards. If an answer included more than one discrete thought, these thoughts were placed on separate cards. In this manner, a response could produce more than one card, and most did. Two of the researchers individually sorted the cards into the smallest number of discrete categories. The individual category systems were then combined, with the third researcher serving as the arbiter. Through this procedure, four category systems were produced. Color and rhythm responses were grouped based on identical match and were noncontroversial.

In the second stage, the category systems were used to code the interviews. Answers to each question

were examined for instances of the categories and one answer could be assigned to multiple category coding. For example, a verbal definition which read "Love is wanting to be with the other person, and makes me feel sure of myself and healthy," would be coded in three categories--togetherness, confident, and healthy.

Two of the researchers were trained on the category systems and reached 90% agreement during practice sessions. Disagreements were discussed and resolved. Coders then individually analyzed answers to four of the six questions (verbal definition, physiological responses, sending love, and receiving love). Interrater reliability was assessed using formulas provided by Holsti (1969) and were .65, .80, .82, and .78 respectively. These were deemed adequate, particularly given the subjective nature of the data. Color and rhythm responses were compiled. The fact that many respondents could not articulate colors and rhythms makes these categories somewhat problematic. The category labels and frequencies are reported in Tables 1-6.

TABLES 1-6 HERE

In the final stage, cluster analysis was used to reduce and combine the data across interview questions. This procedure produced holistic combinations of definitional and communicative perceptions of love. As noted in the SAS manual:

The purpose of cluster analysis is to place objects into groups or clusters suggested by the data, not defined a priori such that objects in a given cluster tend to be similar to each other in some sense, and objects in different clusters tend to be dissimilar (Ray, 1982).

SAS subroutine VARCLUS was utilized with the oblique principle component option (Ray, 1982). A disjoint method was used to place each object or category in one and only one cluster (non-overlapping clusters). These procedures were chosen because they allow a large set of variables to be replaced by a smaller set of clusters with little loss of information and because typically the results are easier to interpret than those produced by other clustering and factoring methods. VARCLUS starts with a single

cluster and continues to interactively split the weaker cluster until further splitting would produce a cluster which explains very little variance.

Determining the number of clusters to examine is a controversial process. Ordinary significance tests are not valid and other procedures are of questionable utility (Ray, 1982). There are no uniformly satisfactory methods for determining the number of clusters (see Everitt, 1979, 1980). We decided, therefore, to use three decision rules. First, we tried to maximize the number of interpretable clusters. Second, we sought to minimize the correlations between clusters to insure independence. Third, we decided that no cluster should have fewer than five members. Based on these criteria, a six cluster solution was selected for interpretation. The cluster names and the main categories within each are reported in Table 7.

TABLE 7 HERE

The success of the clustering procedures may be seen in a variety of ways. First, results show uniformly high correlations between the categories and the their own cluster. Second, there are small ratios of the squared correlation between the categories and the next closest cluster and the squared correlation between the categories and their own cluster. Ultimately, however, success must be judged by the heuristic nature of the clusters. Although the clusters may be applied to styles of loving or types of lovers, they are primarily intended to distinguish among the variety of love experiences reported by respondents.

The first cluster describes Collaborative Love which is characterized by feelings of increased energy and intensified emotional response. Lovers associated with this cluster report that they are supportive of their partners and that their partners reciprocate in this regard. They also report that this mutual form of love communication contributes to their feelings of increased energy. The second cluster, Active Love, is indicated by feelings of strength. This love is experienced through doing things together and is communicated by emotional discussion. The third cluster describes Secure Love. Lovers associated with

this cluster defined love in terms of security and report that love is communicated when their partner talks about intimate topics and does things for them. Intuitive Love constitutes the fourth cluster. This love is experienced (warmth, nervousness, loss of appetite) and communicated (eye contact, togetherness) nonverbally. The fifth cluster is Committed Love which is communicated by being together and talking about future commitment. The final cluster is Traditional Romantic Love. This love is indicated by feeling beautiful and confident. Lovers associated with this cluster rely on their partner to profess their love verbally by saying "I love you" and express their love by doing things for the other person. This cluster is labelled traditional romantic love because it seems to reflect a traditional, idealized notion of love.

DISCUSSION

An examination of the categories derived from the interviews reveals three important findings concerning the nature of love as it is experienced by lovers. First, the categories suggest that love may be conceptualized in a variety of different manners, each reflecting a different realm of experience. As we anticipated, lovers defined love in terms of propositional relational constructs (such as commitment and security), physiological responses (such as intensified emotional experience and feelings of warmth and nervousness), and intuitive perceptions (such as the various colors and rhythms reported by the respondents). Although the questions concerning the "color" and "rhythm" of love were not entirely successful in tapping the intuitive aspects of love (as demonstrated by the generally weaker frequencies of responses), intuitive perceptions were reported as an important means of communicating love (for example, through eye contact and "ways of looking"). In addition to these three manners of conceptualizing love, a fourth appeared in the analysis of the interviews. Some lovers defined love in terms of behavioral actions (such as doing things with and/or for the other). Such responses occurred with a frequency which suggests the salience of behavioral conceptions of love.

Second, any given lover may conceptualize love by employing elements of any or all of the four manners described above. This finding is of key importance. Whereas Rubin suggests that love is

conceptualized only in terms of relational constructs (attachment, caring, and intimacy), the present study finds this not to be the case. Many lovers employed no relational constructs in their definition of love, but rather used only physiological responses or behavioral actions. This indicates that love need not be conceived in strictly relational terms, even when love is reciprocated.

Third, not only is there no single manner of conceptualizing love, there is also no predominant manner. Responses were widely distributed across categories, suggesting a strong pluralism of conceptions.

The categories themselves provide additional information concerning the manners in which people communicate love. While responses to the sending and receiving questions exhibited a great deal of convergence, two important areas of divergence emerged. The first concerns direct love messages (e.g., "I love you") which were reported with a much greater frequency as a means of sending love ($N=57$) than as a love message received from partners ($N=4$). It is possible that this divergence merely represents a perceptual bias. However, it is also possible that lovers attempt to express love directly, but do not interpret direct messages as a true indication of love. Further research may be diagnostic between these explanations.

Sending and receiving categories also diverge in terms of supportiveness, a response common to both sets of categories. Support is seen as expressing love through understanding and acceptance, but is received as an indication of love through reciprocation and responsiveness. If lovers look for reciprocity and responsiveness as a sign of supportiveness (and therefore, love), but attempt to communicate support through other forms (such as acceptance) misunderstandings and misinterpretations are a strong possibility.

While the coding categories indicate a great diversity in love experiences, the cluster analysis demonstrates a strong coherence between lovers' perceptions of love and their reports of how love is communicated. Furthermore, the analysis supports the existence of at least six different types of love

experiences. Although a large majority of the respondents could accurately be placed in one of the six clusters (62 of 76), other respondents may represent mixed types. Indeed, since lovers often used more than one manner of conceptualizing love, it is likely that some lovers reflect more than one perceptual cluster.

Further, there seems to be some overlap between these clusters and constructs reported in previous research. While the collaborative and secure clusters are unique to this study, the three categories derived by Prentice, et al. (1983) seem somewhat comparable to three of the present clusters. Both studies report traditional romantic love, and the routine activity category of Prentice, et al. parallels the active love cluster derived in the current study. The sexual behavior category reported by Prentice, et al. may be a subset of intuitive love as described above. In addition, the committed love cluster reflects the central theme associated with dating couples in Owen's (1984) study of relational interpretation. What is significant, however, is the degree to which the current cluster system integrates and extends the findings of previous research.

The findings of this study have three important implications for future research into the nature of loveships and the communication of love. First, the question should be addressed: How do different types of love experiences fit into relationships? For example, collaborative love seems to require a reciprocal love for a successful relationship, due to the unique means of communicating love associated with this cluster. The same reciprocity seems necessary for intuitive love. However, traditional romantic love may fit successfully with secure or committed love. These issues, in order to be considered fully, require further research employing a sample of love dyads.

A second implication concerns the degree of consistency and flexibility in lovers' perceptions of love and their communication of love. Two questions surround this issue: To what extent do lovers maintain consistent experiences of love across a relationship or a series of relationships? and To what extent do lovers' experiences of love evolve or change through a series of relationships or through the development

of a single relationship? Again, further research is needed, this time employing longitudinal methods.

Finally, this study raises questions concerning the relationship between specific aspects of love and the means of communicating these aspects. Our findings reveal that lovers communicate love through a variety of means and that these means are generally consistent with their perceptions of love. However, the specific link between aspects of love and means of communication remains uncertain.

In this study we have attempted to establish an inductive, more complete understanding of romantic love as it is experienced by lovers and the means by which love is communicated. To these ends, we have largely succeeded. However, this study has only been a first step, albeit an essential one. Many central questions remain to be considered if the nature and communication of romantic love is to be fully understood. Hopefully, the findings of this study will provide an empirically grounded vocabulary for the discussion and examination of these further questions.

REFERENCES

- Alberoni, F. (1983). Falling in Love. Random House: New York.
- Arnold, M. B. (1960). Emotion and Personality. Columbia University Press: New York.
- Averill, J. R. (1980). "A constructivist view of emotion." in R. Plutchik & H. Kellerman (eds.). Emotion: Theory, Research and Experience (Vol. 1). Academic Press: New York.
- Branden, N. (1980). The Psychology of Romantic Love. Houghton Mifflin Co.: Boston.
- Clynes, M. (1978). Sentics: The Touch of Emotions. Anchor Books: Garden City, NY.
- De Rivera, J. (1977). A Structural Theory of the Emotions. International Universities Press: New York.
- DeVito, J. A. (1980). The Interpersonal Communication Book. Harper & Row: New York.
- Everitt, B. (1980). Cluster Analysis (2nd ed.). Heineman Education Books, Ltd.: London.
- Everitt, B. (1979). "Unresolved problems in cluster analysis." Biometrics (35), 169-181.
- Fromm, E. (1956). The Art of Loving. Harper & Row: New York.
- Hendrick, C., S. Hendrick, F. H. Foote, and M. J. Slapton-Foote (1984). "Do men and women love differently?" Journal of Social and Personal Relationships (1), 177-95.
- Holsti, O. R. (1969). Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. Addison-Wesley: Reading Mass.
- Johnston, T. L. & M. E. Jeremko (1979). "Correlational analysis of suggestibility, self-preoccupation, styles of loving, and sensation-seeking." Psychological Reports (45), 23-26.
- Katz, J. M. (1976). "How do you love me? Let me count the ways (The phenomenology of being loved)," Sociological Inquiry (46), 17-22.
- Knapp, M. L. (1978). Social Intercourse: From Greeting to Goodbye. Allyn Bacon, Inc.: Boston.
- Lee, J. L. (1973). Colours of Love: An Exploration of the Ways of Loving. New Press: Toronto.
- Mathes, E. W. (1982). "Mystical experiences, romantic love, and hypnotic susceptibility." Psychological

Reports (50), 701-702.

Montagu, A. (1970). The Direction of Human Development. Hawthorn Books, Inc.: New York.

Morolodo, G. (1982). "Shyness and love in college campus relationships." Perceptual Motor Skills (55), 819-824.

Owen, W. F. (1984). "Interpretive themes in relational communication." Quarterly Journal of Speech (70), 274-87.

Plato (1969). The Symposium, trans. M. Joyce, in Plato: The Collected Dialogues. Princeton University Press: Princeton, N.J.

Prentice, D. S., N. E. Briggs, & D. W. Bradley (1983). "Romantic attitudes of American university students." Psychological Reports (53), 815-822.

Pribram, K. H. (1980). "The biology of emotion." In Plutchik & Kellerman.

Ray, A. E. (ed.) (1982). SAS Users Guide: Statistics. SAS Institute, Inc.: Cary, N.C.

Rubin, Z. (1973). Liking and Loving: An Invitation to Social Psychology. Holt, Rinehart, & Winston: New York.

Rubin, Z. (1970). "Measurement of romantic love." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology (16), 256-273.

Seligman, C., R. H. Fazio, & M. P. Zanna (1980). "Effects of salience of extrinsic rewards on liking and loving." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology (38), 453-460.

Wiseman, R. L., & W. Schenck-Hamlin (1981). "A multidimensional scaling validation of an inductively-derived set of compliance-gaining strategies." Communication Monographs (48), 251-270.

TABLE 1

Verbal Definition Categories^a

<u>Category:</u>	<u>Description:</u>	<u>Frequency:</u>
intensifier	feel other emotions more intensely	58
warm fuzzies	peaceful, caring satisfying	46
doing together	wide range of activities done with other	24
togetherness	connectedness, want to be with other, sharing friendship	21
healthy	healthy feeling, more open to people, feeling of completeness	19
confident	self-assurance, feeling sure	18
negative	variety of negative emotions (e.g., anxiety)	13
think about other	concern for other, anticipating being with other	12
commitment	long-term or future commitment	12
secure	stable, safe, secure	11
needs me	somebody relies on me, needs me	7
autonomy	Independence, freedom	4

^aCategories derived from answers to the question: What is the feeling of love?

[Reliability of coding= .65]

TABLE 2
Physical Definition Categories^a

<u>Category:</u>	<u>Description:</u>	<u>Frequency:</u>
energy	more energy, intensified feelings	24
beautiful	beautiful, healthy, mature, intelligent	13
warmth	warm, safe, secure	11
nervous	butterflies, knot in stomach	7
feel strong	stronger	4
appetite loss	can't eat	4

^aCategories derived from answers to the question: What physiological factors or changes are associated with love?

[Reliability of coding= .80]

TABLE 3
Sending Categories^a

<u>Category:</u>	<u>Description:</u>	<u>Frequency:</u>
told her/him	face-to-face and telephone conversation	57
	saying "I love you"	
doing things	doing special or traditional things for	37
	other	
support	understanding, attentive	33
physical	touch	32
being together	just being with other	24
negotiate	talk things out, cooperate	10
future commitment	plan or discuss future, commit to other	8
	forever	
written	notes, letters, cards	8
sexual	sex with other	8
nonverbal	smiles, dress, relaxed look	8
eye contact	look in eyes, looking at other	7

^aCategories derived from answers to the question: How do/did you communicate your love to your partner?

[Reliability of coding= .82]

TABLE 4
Receiving Categories^a

<u>Category:</u>	<u>Description:</u>	<u>Frequency:</u>
touch	physical or sexual contact	33
supportive	responds to me, reciprocates, lets me be myself	30
do for me	actions done for me	28
togetherness	meshing, harmony, shows need for me	21
communicating emotion	tells me what s/he is feeling	21
eye contact	look in eyes, way s/he looks at me	14
future commitment	plans or discusses future, commits to me forever	10
facial expression	smiles, look on face	5
other told me	other says "I love you"	4
vocalics	sound of other's voice	3
topics	reveals or talks about intimate topics	2

^aCategories derived from the question: How does/did your partner communicate her/his love to you?

[Reliability of coding= .78]

TABLE 5

Colors of Love^a

<u>Color:</u>	<u>Frequency:</u>
blue	16
yellow	9
red	7
other	6
situational/changes	4
bright	4
oranges	3
multiple	3

^aResponses to question: If this love has/had a color what is/was it?

TABLE 6
Rhythms of Love^a

<u>Rhythm:</u>	<u>Frequency:</u>
steady	11
higher and higher	10
wave	8
high, flowing	4
strong	4
zig zag	3
faster and faster	2
erratic	2
situational/changes	1
circle	1
up and then plateau	1

^aResponses to the question: If you could say a rhythm expresses/expressed this love, what would it be?

TABLE 7: Love Clusters

<u>Cluster Name:</u>	<u>Verbal Definition:</u>	<u>Physical Definition:</u>	<u>Sending:</u>	<u>Receiving:</u>	<u>Color:</u>	<u>Rhythm:</u>
COLLABORATIVE LOVE [N=18]	Intensifier [.21 ^a /.13 ^b] Healthy [.11/.24]	Energy [.41/.03]	Negotiate [.42/.06] Support [.21/.05]	Supportive [.53/.05] Touch [.15/.29]	Red [.22/.19]	Zig-Zag [.26/.02]
ACTIVE LOVE [N=10]	Doing Together [.56/.05]	Strong [.74/.01]		Comm. Emotion [.23/.16]		Erratic [.61/.00] Faster & Faster [.47/.01]
SECURE LOVE [N=6]	Secure [.14/.03]			Topics [.73/.02] Do for me [.25/.22]	Blue [.24/.04]	Circle [.72/.02]
INTUITIVE LOVE [N=11]		Warmth [.28/.02] Nervous [.21/.07] Appetite Loss [.21/.04]	Eye contact [.56/.04] Nonverbal [.39/.03]	Eye contact [.34/.02] Together-ness [.14/.18]	Bright [.12/.02] Multiple [.12/.07]	
COMMITTED LOVE [N=7]			Being Together [.71/.02] Future Commitment [.63/.19]	Future Commitment [.38/.10]	Yellow [.31/.07]	Steady [.15/.08]
TRADITIONAL ROMANTIC LOVE [N=10]	Confident [.16/.04]	Beautiful [.49/.05]	Doing Things [.38/.11] Told Him/her [.18/.24]	Other Told me [.54/.01]		Wave [.21/.06]

^aSquared correlation between the category and its own cluster. Values above .10 are reported here.

^bRatio = $\frac{\text{squared correlation between category and next closest cluster}}{\text{squared correlation between category and own cluster}}$

(The smaller this ratio, the better the cluster fit).